

REMARKS

Applicant's attorney is appreciative of the interview granted by Examiners Cleveland and Miller on June 29, 2009. At that interview, an amendment to Claim 15 was proposed, and agreement was reached that this amendment would distinguish over the references of record.

Claims 15-19 and 22 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Delperier et al, while Claim 20 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Delperier et al in view of Valentian and Carroll et al and Claim 21 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Delperier et al.

Claim 15 has now been amended as proposed at the interview, to recite a substrate having a first lateral surface at which the object is supported for processing, at an opposite lateral surface. Further, Claim 15 has been amended to recite that the pore channels in the stabilized framework are disposed between the first lateral surface and the opposite lateral surface, and open onto the first lateral surface and the opposite lateral surface to enable gas flow from the opposite lateral surface to the first lateral surface for treatment of the object by the gas which has passed through the pore channels.

Commensurate with this amendment, Applicant has submitted new copies of Figures 3-5. These are photomicrographs; the file copies of these drawings were of poor quality, and it was difficult to discern the drawing detail.

In particular, in Figure 3 there is an arrow 30 showing the gas flow pathway. Taken together with Figure 1, the proposed amendment to the claims is clearly supported by the specification.

The Delperier et al reference discloses a densification process for producing crucibles for containing liquid silicon in an installation for drawing silicon single crystals. The

object of this treatment does not result in a porous article for the purpose of a gas treatment.

Two points were made in the Office action. The first point was that according to the process of Delperier et al, the densification will inherently begin at the point of first contact between the gas and the part, in this case, the exterior surface. It was alleged that to ensure penetration of the gas into the part, one of ordinary skill would have aimed the densifying gas into the part, and that Delperier's teaching of sweeping the gas across the part is evidence of a desire to localize the densification process.

This allegation is clearly inconsistent with the teachings of Delperier et al, which specifically teaches in paragraph [0008] that variations of the microstructure and the material of the matrix between different portions of the densified parts is a defect, and which teaches in paragraph [0010] that it is an object of the invention to obtain relatively uniform densification. Paragraph [0013] of Delperier et al explains how relatively uniform densification is obtained according to the Delperier et al process. Accordingly, Delperier et al clearly does not teach or suggest localized densification.

As to the allegation that Delperier et al discloses end caps through which gas can flow, Applicant has now amended Claim 15 to recite the direction of flow of gas through the substrate as being between the lateral surfaces. Since Delperier et al clearly does not disclose or suggest a method for obtaining a material in which gas is able to flow through lateral surfaces, the claimed invention is clearly distinguished from the Delperier et al reference.

Valentian, like Delperier et al, relates to a crucible for use in a device for making single crystals. Consequently, Valentian also does not disclose a susceptor having passage

openings formed by pores through which gas can flow in order to treat an object arranged on the susceptor; the crucible disclosed by Valentian must be solid to retain a liquid.

Carroll et al relates to a method of densifying a porous preform having a porous interior region of graded carbon-silicon carbide. There is no disclosure or suggestion of a porous susceptor for treating objects, so the reference does not cure the defects of Delperier et al.

Withdrawal of these rejections is requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the present application is now in condition for allowance. An early allowance of the application with amended claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Ira J. Schultz
Registration No. 28666
Attorney for Applicant
(703) 837-9600, ext. 23

Dennison, Schultz & MacDonald
1727 King Street, Suite 105
Alexandria, VA 22314